

States. We have to build a relationship on trust.

Okay, I would say. Mr. Fox, let us start here. I want you to agree to sell us oil at below OPEC prices every time they try to blackmail us. What do you think the answer would be? I wonder.

I would ask him again, President Fox, What specific step is your government willing to take in the direction of increased privatization of the Mexican industry, Mexican economy. Are you willing to give up the oil company? Are you willing to privatize in order to spur economic growth?

If not, do not look to the United States to be your safety valve, to take all of your unemployed, all of your poverty. Because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, as long as we continue to do that there will never be any pressure on Mexico to reform itself, as long as we are there acting as that safety valve.

I will ask him, Mr. Fox, Will you stop the practice of handing out survival kits to those people about ready to come into the United States illegally? An agency of the government hands out a paper bag, 200,000 at last count, to people coming across the border into the United States illegally, paper bags filled with maps, little how-to-survive in the desert, condoms. Go ask them what is the purpose. But, anyway, that is what they give them, some water.

Will you stop that, Mr. Fox? Because you say you want to stop illegal immigration in the United States, why are you promoting it by handing them out "survival kits"? Will you stop that as a friendly nation?

Will you publicly condemn those members of the Mexican Government who have called for the recolonization of the southwestern United States by Mexican nationals? They have done so. Bizarre as that sounds, they have done so.

I guess also, Mr. Fox, I would have to ask you, Why are you encouraging your people to take dual citizenships in the United States? In 1998, Mexico passed a law allowing for dual citizenships of their people. Since then somewhere close to 6 million Mexican-Americans, or I should not say Mexican-Americans because there are probably others involved, but so far 6 million people have accepted that particular identification as a dual citizen. Why are you doing that, Mr. Fox? I ask our own government, Why do we allow that?

When a person becomes a citizen of this country, they are supposed to raise their hand and swear that they give up allegiance to any foreign power or potentate, I think is the word that they use. How is it that you can have a dual citizenship and call yourself an American? How can that happen, Mr. Fox? President Bush, I would ask you the same question.

So those are some of the questions that I would pose to the President of Mexico, the Republic of Mexico or the

United States of Mexico, whatever it calls itself now. Those are the questions I would pose. I hope that someone will ask them. I doubt if they will.

I will tell you that those are the questions I want answers to before I would move one step forward in the area of immigration, liberalization. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to reduce legal immigration in the United States from the present 1 million a year to about 300,000 a year.

I would, of course, take any action I could to stop illegal immigration. I would fine those employers who continue to use this form of illegal employment. I would put troops on the border. I would do what is necessary to protect our border; or I would say let us dissolve it. But let us have the debate here. It is one or the other. Either you have a border or you do not. Either it is meaningful or it is not. But before we go 20 years down the road and we look back and say, gee, how did it happen, that it sort of just evaporated, it is just gone, how did that occur, I would just as soon have us in this body debate that topic, have a vote up or down. Shall we eliminate the borders or not? If we decide not to, then we have to decide to enforce them.

#### MILITARY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the Chair would recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for half the time remaining before midnight, or approximately 56 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to address a crucial issue for the future of our Nation, the military strategy that will govern our armed services.

In 1923, then-Major George C. Marshall was asked to give a speech on national defense. He briefly recounted the history of the Army's end-strengths since the Revolutionary War and noted a consistent pattern. After every conflict the United States immediately and significantly decreased the size of the Army, only to have to increase it dramatically the next time a conflict broke out.

U.S. leaders continued to act as if the absence of an immediate threat justified a dramatic decrease in the size of U.S. forces and the defense budget. The astonishing fact, Marshall said, is that we continue to follow a regular cycle in the doing and undoing of measures for national defense.

Nearly 80 years later in the aftermath of the Cold War, we find ourselves caught in the same pattern. Our active duty military has shrunk from 2.1 million people in fiscal year 1989 to 1.4 million for the coming fiscal year, a decline of 34 percent.

Some in the administration may argue that this decline is reasonable

and that further forced cuts are justified because we do not face a global peer competitor, but neither did the United States in 1923. Yet less than 20 years later it found itself at the center of a massive global conflict.

Mr. Speaker, this pattern must stop. Why must we as Members of Congress think about questions of national strategy? My first answer goes back to that 1923 Marshall speech that Congress and the administration must bring stability to the size of our force and the resources that support it, both in the current budget and in the out-years. Stability ensures the United States can counter any threat to its interest, can fulfill its responsibility as the world's lone superpower, and can live up to the trust all those who serve in the military should have in their government.

Second, the Constitution charges the Congress to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. This is a sacred duty that transcends merely authorizing and appropriating annual funds for defense department and military services.

Remember, it was Congress that crafted the Goldwater-Nichols legislation that strengthened the chain of command to U.S. benefit in conflicts like the Gulf War, and Congress had upgraded professional military education. We must now give thoughtful consideration to where our Nation is heading and what the proper role and size of our military is in this current world.

Third, I have had the great fortune of serving on the Committee on Armed Services for over 2 decades. In that time I have participated in scores and scores of briefings and hearings and have conferred widely with active duty and retired military officers, defense experts, military historians and, most importantly, our troops. Through their wisdom and generosity, I have learned quite a bit; and I have come to some opinions about what our military should be doing for our country.

It is an old speech-writing ploy to say that the United States stands at a unique moment in history, but in this case it happens to be true. There is no single overwhelming threat to the United States and its interests. There is no political-economic ideology to rival our democracy in capitalism, the United States the world's leading military and economic power. It has brought not only economic progress, but democracy and stability to many parts of the world.

On balance, the United States has provided great benefits to the world through its leadership. We should feel a great sense of accomplishment at that. But this elevated position creates responsibilities. The United States must continue to lead; we must consciously

fan the fire of our leadership to serve as a beacon for those friends and allies who would follow us. We must work with them as partners without arrogance, recognizing that together we can make the world a better and safer place.

Leading in the 21st century means leading globally. The Asia-Pacific region is increasingly critical to our future security because of its population, growing economic strength, advancing military capabilities, and potential for conflict. Yet our leadership cannot focus on this region at the expense of others where U.S. interests remain strong, particularly Europe and the Persian Gulf.

In addition to requiring global leadership, our world position makes us a tempting target for those who would attack us. We may face direct challenges, attacks on our homeland, our citizens and soldiers overseas and our military and commercial information systems. We may face indirect challenges as well as those who resent our leadership seek to increase the cost of our global position and seek to block access to the ports and battlefields of the future.

We may face challenges to our allies and friends in conventional and unconventional forms that affect our own national interest. We may continue to face challenges associated with being a global leader as others ask us to contribute troops to keep the peace and stem violence.

Given the breadth of these challenges, our national military strategy continues to matter, and the size and strength of our military matter as well. A good force structure with the wrong strategy is useless; so is a good strategy with the wrong forces.

Getting the strategy right requires asking what the military must be able to do. In basic terms, we ask the military to prevent attacks on U.S. interests and to respond if prevention fails.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, let us look at each in turn. I use prevention to mean two broad categories of activities that together protect U.S. interests, maintain U.S. world leadership, and minimize the likelihood that the military will have to fight.

The first preventive element of our military strategy is the protection of the U.S. homeland as it is our most fundamental national interest. We know of a number of states and nonstate actors that may seek to counter U.S. conventional strength through attacks that may involve weapons of mass destruction.

To counter these threats, the United States needs a comprehensive homeland security strategy, and I have called for this in legislation. To be sure, a limited missile defense system is part of such an effort, but the obses-

sion of national missile defense by some as a "Maginot line in the sky" has become theological. Secretary Rumsfeld rightly points out that we cannot predict all of the threats that we will face, just as no one predicted Pearl Harbor or Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. But yet his strategy lacks the flexibility to deal with a range of threats when it puts such significant emphasis and resources on a single threat to be countered with missile defense. Missile defense systems should be treated as a weapons system like any other, and it should be only one part of the U.S. approach to protecting its citizens.

Homeland security must include continued support for nonproliferation programs, including cooperative threat reduction programs with states of the former Soviet Union. It must include great resources for intelligence and coordinated response mechanisms among a range of government agencies. Comprehensive homeland security, not merely the one element represented by missile defense, should be the focus of our efforts.

Beyond physical attacks, the United States is now vulnerable to increasingly sophisticated information warfare capabilities targeted at our military communications or at critical domestic infrastructure. The diffusion of technology allows many states and nonstate actors to target the United States directly through cyberspace at a fraction of the cost of confronting us with conventional forces.

Our own information operations war games, like 1997's Eligible Receiver, showed that even a small group of attackers could break into the power grids of major American cities and disrupt military command and control systems. In such a scenario, our very technological superiority becomes a weakness with potentially devastating consequences for both infrastructure and the lives of our citizens and troops.

In considering how to deal with information warfare, the United States must build robust offensive and defensive capabilities and ensure that the information and communications that enable combat operations is secure. To do this, the Department of Defense should focus on integrating information operations into broader operational planning and on updating information operations doctrine.

The second preventive element of our strategy is shaping the global environment through active U.S. military engagement. The absence of this requirement in current administration rhetoric deeply troubles me. To speak of the importance of engagement is not simply a liberal effort to make the world a better place, it is one of the best means of maintaining alliance relationships, deterring adversaries, encouraging civilian control of military in foreign countries, and gathering

vital intelligence throughout the world.

If we want to reduce the number of contingencies to which the United States is asked to send troops, we must pursue engagement as a means of preventing such conflicts before they happen. This vital engagement function takes two forms.

First, it requires presence, both through permanent basing and temporary deployments and ports of call. The changing global landscape may require basing in new locations. We should consider the use of an Indonesian island, greater presence in Guam, smaller deployments throughout Southeast Asia, and the shifting of more European forces to the southeast of that continent.

We must also be creative in how we use bases, adopting more of a lily-pad approach to basing that will allow us to use forces without overly stressing local communities. Frogs do not live on lily pads, but they use them when needing to get where they want to go.

Beyond presence, engagement must involve continued military-to-military exchanges and international military education. This is our best means of affecting the senior leaders' leadership of other countries and of building expertise in their cultures and doctrines. These relationships should be the last thing we cut in times when we are trying to send a political message. Cutting contacts discourages the positive changes we are seeking to effect in many countries.

In the end, our ability to shape the global environment to the benefit of our national security depends on a multifaceted approach, the linchpin of which is continued engagement and collaboration with other countries.

If our strategy takes these preventive actions for the homeland and through global presence, it must then focus on required military capabilities if prevention fails. Without a credible, overwhelming warfighting capability, the United States cannot deter would-be aggressors and cannot maintain global leadership.

There is no simple, elegant proposition for the warfighting element of the strategy to replace the two-major-theater-war construct, but let me offer a notional "1-2-3" approach.

One, we must be able to fight and win decisively at low risk a major regional conflict. Two, we must be able to conduct serious military actions in at least two other regions simultaneously to deter those who would take advantage of our distraction in a major conflict.

Three, at the same time, we must be able to undertake at least three small-scale contingencies throughout the world. Our recent history has shown that this level of demand is simply a reality. Therefore, we should plan for it and accept it as the price of global leadership.



I have agonized, Mr. Speaker, over the risk of abandoning our two-major-theater-war force-sizing approach. While I know we do not currently have the troops to support it, I still believe we must determine our strategy first and only then determine the size of our force.

Our vital interests are spread throughout Europe, the Persian Gulf and East Asia, and therefore we must maintain the ability to undertake significant military action in any combination of these three regions. Many States continue to plow resources into conventional and particularly antiaccess capabilities. While it is true that Iraq's capabilities have been eroded by sanctions and North Korea's by economic stagnation, both countries maintain significant conventional strength. The Taiwan Straits remain a potential flashpoint.

The U.S. military has not given sufficient consideration to how the United States might have to respond if a large-scale conflict broke out between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. These are the presently foreseeable regions in which a major regional conflict seems most likely to occur.

Now, I agree with Secretary Rumsfeld that the likelihood of any two of these happening at any given moment is remote. Yet the United States must continue to have a multitheater capability. We must have enough forces to deter an attack of opportunity if we are engaged in a major theater war. For these reasons, I believe any move to a one-MTW capability must be accompanied by the ability to undertake significant military actions in two other places as well. These would not be "holding" actions, but a credible capability to deter adventurism and to protect crucial interests in those regions.

The third element of the "1-2-3" approach to countering conventional threats to U.S. national interests is, the United States will continue to take part in small-scale contingencies in areas of lesser concern. At any given moment, there may be more or less than three such contingencies. The evidence of the last 10 years shows such a tempo is likely, particularly if you consider the continued deployments to keep peace in the Balkans and to maintain the no-fly zones in Iraq. Military planning should be able to contend with at least that number.

Many voices have called for scaling our commitments back and limiting the duration of U.S. involvement. We in Congress will continue to ask tough questions about how we get involved and how to complete the mission, but being involved is the price of global leadership. We must acknowledge this fact and plan our forces accordingly.

Finally, getting the strategy right means communicating that strategy effectively throughout the military

services. Doing so means incorporating national strategic thinking into the outstanding professional military education system which already exists. Those in our intermediate and senior war colleges must understand how the tactics, operational art, and battlefield strategy they study fit within the broader national military strategy their civilian leaders devise.

We have the world's best military education system; an effective military strategy must ensure that excellence continues. As William Francis Butler so aptly said, any nation that separates its fighting men from its scholars will have its fighting done by fools and its thinking done by cowards.

When taken together, Mr. Speaker, these strategic elements are similar to those put forward by Secretary Rumsfeld. With the most notable exception of his downplaying of engagement activities, I believe he has gotten much of the strategy right.

He has also rightly put attention on the need to transform a percentage of our forces and to invest in certain critical capabilities. The United States must be able to protect space-based communications and other systems. It must search for increasingly effective intelligence capabilities. It must procure sophisticated stand-off capabilities to ensure that we can deliver firepower when confronted with antiaccess strategy.

Finally, the Department must further joint warfighting through approaches like standing joint task forces. The Secretary has already articulated these requirements effectively.

What he gets wrong is his approach to the troops. Technology is critical, but in many cases it cannot substitute for boots on the ground. Cutting forces directly would be dead wrong. The alternative approach of forcing each of the services to make their own cuts is even worse. This approach would force each service to make cuts in a vacuum, and would abrogate America's responsibility to match force structure to the strategy it prescribes.

The stability then-Major George C. Marshall spoke of requires force structure consistency within an acceptable range for the health of our armed services. These services are only as good and effective as those they can entice to serve. Recruitment and retention efforts are damaged when end-strength numbers vary widely. Why should a young person commit to serving if he or she knows they may lose their jobs when the government next cuts the size of the military? Keeping faith with those who serve means maintaining a stable military base.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the strategy I have articulated here requires significant forces, in some cases more than we have today. The United States requires an Army, an Army of forces to

fight a major theater war, to deter a second such conflict, to undertake peacekeeping operations, and to take part in engagement operations. If you consider that we used the equivalent of some 10 ground force divisions in the Gulf War, it is hard to see how we could fight one major conventional war while taking on any other missions with our current force. This and the reality of high current OPTEMPO rates argue for additional forces.

At a minimum, we should secure an increase in the size of the active duty Army by 20,000 soldiers to an end strength of 500,000, while maintaining 10 active duty divisions. Just last month, Secretary White and General Shinseki testified before our committee that the Army could use 520,000 to meet the requirements of today's missions; 500,000 is the minimum force size needed to implement this strategy.

In addition, we should support Army transformation efforts. The Army has given careful thought as to how it must face future challenges; these efforts deserve administration and congressional support.

Our strategy will continue to put great demands on the Navy for presence, ensuring access to conflict areas, and to providing firepower to those fighting on the ground. In this service, a greater number of ships, along with a modest increase in end strength, is desperately needed.

□ 2230

The Navy currently has approximately 315 ships. Over time, given our current replacement shipbuilding rate, that figure would drop to 230. Such a decline is appalling for a global naval power with global requirements. The scope of our commitments argues for a 400-ship Navy. This should be our goal. At a minimum, however, we should build toward the Navy's articulated requirement of 360 ships. We must also devote resources to developing innovative ships capable of operating in the littoral—such as a Cebrowski-class of "streetfighters"—as a complement to our fleet of capital ships. Such new platforms may well have great warfighting value, provide presence on the cheap, and serve as a counterforce to others' anti-access capabilities.

The Air Force is currently well-sized for the present strategy and will continue to play a vital role across the spectrum of conflict. The Aerospace Expeditionary Force concept is essential for allowing the Air Force to deal effectively with the tempo of current operations.

While the Air Force does not require greater force structure, it will need additional capabilities. The Air Force will need to recapitalize its aging fleet. In addition, the distances involved in a strategy more oriented toward Asia must involve greater airlift and more long-range capabilities, like the B-2.

Finally, the Marine Corps is well suited to both contingency operations and major theater war in the 21st century. In addition, they are developing urban warfare capabilities highly relevant to future conflicts. While Marine force structure is appropriate to their missions, they require a modest increase in end-strength to allow fuller manning of existing units and a relief to some OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO demands. We must ensure that the Marine Corps continues to be able to provide the swift, forward action required by future challenges.

Taken together, these changes result in a larger force. The administration is right to say that we currently have a mismatch between strategy and force structure, but the answer is not to explain away the requirements of our global role. The answer is to size a force appropriate to the roles we must play.

Some might argue that we can accomplish these missions with fewer forces if we accept larger risks. This is a fool's economy. We must give the services the tools they need to fight and win decisively within low to moderate levels of risk. We must also lower risks to readiness by ensuring adequate forces for rotations. Mitigating these risks by modestly increasing the size of the force is the best way to provide the stability in U.S. forces that then-Major George C. Marshall sought in 1923. Only then will we be prepared to meet any challenge that will confront us.

Budgetary concerns alone should not determine our national military strategy. However, we must acknowledge the difficulty of both modernizing our forces and ensuring they have the capabilities needed to fight on any 21st century battlefield, without cutting force structure. Alleviating these pressures will require effort on both sides. We in Congress must keep national strategy in mind when allocating defense resources. President Bush recently expressed his hope that "Congress' priority is a strong national defense." I can tell you that for many of us, Democrat and Republican, this is the case.

But for its part, the administration must make the priority of national defense as or more important than a tax cut. The military truly requires and deserves a greater budgetary top-line and a larger percentage of discretionary spending. The Department must follow through on the management reforms that Secretary Rumsfeld and the service secretaries have rightly highlighted to achieve cost savings.

At the end of the day, my approach is nothing more than Harry Truman common sense. Implementing effective strategy requires inspired leadership by the President and Secretary of Defense. I say again, inspired leadership. I hope the current administration will provide it. Conversations about strategy tend to stay within policy elites.

But at its most fundamental level, the impact of this strategy we make is felt by every member of the service. They must have confidence that their leaders will consistently fund defense at levels that allow them to do their jobs proudly and effectively. If we fail to do that, we undermine not only our strategy but all those Americans we should inspire to serve.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by commending the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his very appropriate and very logical comments which I will follow up on in a few moments.

Before doing so, however, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my personal tribute to one of our colleagues who passed away over the break, the Honorable FLOYD SPENCE. I had known FLOYD SPENCE as many of our colleagues did in a very personal way over the past 15 years that I have served in the Congress. He was a leader on national security issues when I came to the Congress. He was one of those individuals that I looked up to for guidance and for early orientation to fully understand the role of the Congress in making sure that our military was being properly supported.

Congressman SPENCE, Chairman SPENCE, was one of those very unique individuals who had severe health problems, in fact had a major double lung transplant, and had gone through turmoil in his life from the health standpoint. I can remember the days when they wheeled him to the floor of the House in a wheelchair with a ventilator, yet he came back and rose to become the full chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and for 6 years he led this body in issues affecting our national security.

He was a quiet man, a gentleman, someone that never had a cross word for anyone, even those he disagreed with and was someone who would be a role model for someone aspiring to become a Member of this body. He had a profound influence. During a time of difficulty in the 1990s when defense budgets were not what they should have been, it was Chairman FLOYD SPENCE who rose above the political fray and led this Congress in a very bipartisan way to increase defense spending by approximately \$43 billion over President Clinton's request for defense over a 6-year time period. If it had not been for Chairman SPENCE fighting tirelessly for our military, for the quality of life for our troops, if it had not been for Chairman SPENCE fighting for

modernization and fighting for the basic dignity of our military, I do not know where we would be today, Mr. Speaker, because the summary I am going to give following this tribute to Chairman SPENCE will outline some very severe problems in our military.

Thank goodness Chairman SPENCE was here. Thank goodness he was fighting the battle. Thank goodness he was building bipartisan coalitions on behalf of the sons and daughters of America serving in uniform. He did a fantastic job in this body. He was someone who had many friends on both sides of the aisle and someone who will be terribly missed. I could not attend the funeral of Chairman SPENCE because I was in Huntsville, Alabama, giving a major speech to 800 people on missile defense.

It was only because of Chairman SPENCE's leadership that we have moved missile defense along as far as it has gone. As a tribute to him on that opening day of the conference, the entire group joined in a prayer together, a prayer of sympathy for the family of FLOYD, for his wife and his sons, and to let all of America know that FLOYD SPENCE has been a true champion, one of our real patriots.

It was just last April, Mr. Speaker, where I had the pleasure of recognizing Chairman FLOYD SPENCE at our annual national fire and emergency services dinner. We have two types of defenders that we support in America: Our international defenders, our military, and FLOYD SPENCE was definitely their champion. That night as we have for the past 14 years, we honored our domestic defenders.

Our domestic defenders are the men and women who serve in the 32,000 organized fire and EMS departments all across the country. We honored FLOYD SPENCE that night because 6 months prior, in last year's defense authorization bill, it was FLOYD SPENCE as chairman working with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who just left this Chamber, who allowed me to move forward legislation that created a grant program to provide matching funds for local fire and EMS departments so that they can better equip themselves to be America's domestic defenders. On that night, 2,000 leaders of the fire and emergency services from all over America gave FLOYD SPENCE a standing ovation for the work that he had done on behalf of our domestic defenders.

So FLOYD SPENCE's legacy is a legacy that all of us could look up to and hope to achieve, one of supporting those people who wear the uniform, the uniform to protect America overseas, and the uniform to protect America at home. To FLOYD's family, his wife, his sons, we say thank you for giving us a tireless public servant whose legacy will live on forever, who did so much in such a short period of time and who will be so sorely missed in this body